UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

SHAWN RUYBAL,	Case No. 2:15-cv-00508-GMN-NJK
Plaintiff(s), vs.))) ORDER
LIBERTY MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY, et al.,	
Defendant(s).)))

Pending before the Court is the parties' proposed Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order, Docket No. 17, which is **DENIED** for the reasons discussed below.¹

First, proposed discovery plans must state the date on which the first defendant answered or otherwise appeared. Local Rule 26-1(e)(1). The discovery plan in this case refers to the answer filed on April 27, 2015, but fails to acknowledge that Defendants filed a motion to dismiss a month earlier on March 27, 2015. *See* Docket No. 5.

Second, proposed discovery plans must state the number of days sought for discovery calculated from the date the first defendant answers or otherwise appears. Local Rule 26-1(e)(1). The parties failed to do so, and instead calculate the discovery period based on the filing of the answer rather than the earlier motion to dismiss. *See* Docket No. 17 at 2.

¹ In addition to the deficiencies outlined herein, the discovery plan was also not timely. *See* Docket No. 16.

Case 2:15-cv-00508-GMN-NJK Document 18 Filed 05/18/15 Page 2 of 2

Third, the presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days <u>calculated from the date the</u> <u>first defendant answers or otherwise appears</u>. *See* Local Rule 26-1(e)(1). When the parties seek a longer discovery period, they must indicate "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED" on the face of the proposed discovery plan. Local Rule 26-1(d). The parties failed to do so.²

Fourth, when a discovery period is sought that is longer than 180 days calculated from the date the first defendant answers or otherwise appears, the parties must provide a statement of the reason(s) why they seek a longer time period. Local Rule 26-1(d). The parties failed to do so.

For the reasons discussed more fully above, the parties' proposed discovery plan is **DENIED**. The parties shall file, no later than May 22, 2015, a proposed discovery plan that complies with the applicable local rules.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 18, 2015

NANCY J. KOPPF

United States Magistrate Judge

² When the discovery plan conforms to the Local Rules, it is required to include a notation on its face in bold that it is being "SUBMITTED IN COMPLIANCE WITH LR 26-1(e)." Local Rule 26-1(d). The pending discovery plan provides no notation of any kind.